UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/721,399	10/721,399 11/25/2003 Francois Baccelli		YOR920030277US1 (8728-634	8078
	7590 01/08/200 SSOCIATES, LLC	EXAMINER		
130 WOODBU	RY ROAD	BOKHARI, SYED M		
WOODBURY,	N1 11/9/		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2416	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/08/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Applicant(s)	
BACCELLI ET AL.	
Art Unit	
2416	
	BACCELLI ET AL.  Art Unit

	SYEDE	OKHARI	2416				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ears on th	ne cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 10 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLIC	ATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (´ eal (with a	l) an amendment, affidavit appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of th	e final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	dvisory Ac ater than S	tion, or (2) the date set forth i	date of the final rejection	n.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slaset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and shortened s than three	d the corresponding amount o statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	liance wit	h 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thei	reof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
	but prior t	o the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con		n and/or search (see NOT	E below);				
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•						
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or</li></ul>	ter form f	or appeal by materially red	ucing or simplifying th	ne issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	correspor	ding number of finally reie	cted claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	·	, ,					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See a	ttached Notice of Non-Cor	npliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	:						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	lowable if	submitted in a separate, t	mely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			be entered and an ex	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over the entered because the affidavit or other evidence.</li> </ol>	vercome	<u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.			condition for allowan	ce because:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	(PTO/SB/	08) Paper No(s)					
/Kwang B. Yao/	/	Syed Bokhari/					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2416	E	Examiner, Art Unit 2416 2/22/2008					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant states in the remarks regarding claim 1, "McCanne does not teach or suggest a method for configuring an overlay spanning tree, much less, defining a target bandwidth less than a maximum link bandwidth of the edges of the overlay spanning tree given a fully connected overlay distribution graph". Examiner respectfully disagrees. McCanne teaches "wherein determining the configuration of the overlay spanning tree comprises defining a target bandwidth less than a maximum link bandwidth of the edges of the overlay spanning tree given a fully connected overlay distribution graph (see paragraph 0033 lines 12-17)". It expalins further, in paragraph 0047 and lines 1-11 where it states that the overlay model forward application-level flows in a bandwidth managed fashion. Therefore, roters will thin the the streamn (i.e. to reduce the bandwidth as compare to the avilable bandwith) to ensure that defined bandwidth constrains are adhered. Applicant states that "McCanne bandwidth constraint is not analogous to the claimed target bandwith; the claimed target bandwidth is used as a threshold to remove edges having bandwidths below the threshold bandwidth(choke point in a process of configuring an overlay spanning tree". Examiner respectfully disagrees. As explained before, McCanne teaches the claimed invention where it creates or configures the overlay router to perform stream thinning or reducing the bandwidth attains from the bandwidth allocator (further explained in paragraph 0109 lines 1-9).